

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/760,017	01/12/2001	Michel Le Hir	60,130-984	2860	
26096	7590 02/26/2003				
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C. 400 WEST MAPLE ROAD SUITE 350			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			TAMAI, KARL I		
BIRMINGHA	AM, MI 48009		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2834		
			DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003	DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)		7
Advisory Action	09/760,017	HIR ET AL.	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tamai IE Karl	2834	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 17 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a h	
<u> </u>	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension of the fee. The appropriate extensioning in the final Office action; or	on ion
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) M they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the	Э
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment	İ
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec		dered but does NOT place the	
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1,4,5 and 8.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 2,3,6 and 7	, ,		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.	
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	Kan	
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	ba	PRIMARY EXAMINER	
		Tamai IE Karl Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2834	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's argument that Schechinger does not teach a magnet on the commutator surface is not peruasive. The magnet is clearly shown as element 34 in figure 2,and the applicant

has not claimed the commutator body as a single integrated unit. The rejection is proper.

Continuation of 10. Other: The amended title would have overcome the objection to the title. The amended claim 8 would have overcom the minor objection to the claim.